arXiv:1703.04076v1 [math.RA] 12 Mar 2017

On solvable elements in the Weyl algebra

Chaowen Zhang
Department of Mathematics,
China University of Mining and Technology,
Xuzhou, 221116, Jiang Su, P. R. China

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 16S32; 16W50.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field of characteristic zero. The Weyl algebra A over $\mathbb{F}$ is an associative algebra with generators p, q satisfying the relation ([5, 11])

$$[p, q] = pq - qp = 1.$$

This algebra was first introduced by H. Weyl. The n-th Weyl algebra A_n over $\mathbb{F}$ is defined by $2n$ generators $p_1, q_1, \cdots, p_n, q_n$, subject to the relations

$$[p_i, p_j] = [q_i, q_j] = 0, \quad [p_i, q_j] = \delta_{ij},$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol (see [4, 6, 9, 11]).

In [5], Dixmier proposed the following question: Is an algebra endomorphism of A necessarily an automorphism? This question is generalized to all the Weyl algebras, known as the Dixmier Conjecture. It was shown that the Dixmier conjecture is stably equivalent to the Jacobian Conjecture (See [1, 2, 4, 9, 11]). But currently, the Dixmier Conjecture remains open even for the case $n = 1$.

For convenience, we say that an element $x \in A$ is *solvable* if there is an element $y \in A$ such that

$$(\text{ad } x)y =: [x, y] = 1,$$

and x is *unsolvable* if it is not solvable. Since $[y, -x] = [x, y]$ for $x, y \in A$, y is also solvable if x is so. Let $\text{Aut}(A)$ denote the group of all the algebra automorphisms of A. Then it is clear that if x is solvable, so is $\Phi(x)$ for any $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(A)$. Properties of solvable elements are studies in [6, 7] and especially, a necessary condition for an element being solvable is given in [7].

In this paper we show that to determine all solvable elements in A is closely related to the Dixmier's above question. We give some sufficient conditions for an element in A being unsolvable, and we also study the properties of solvable elements.

The paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2 we give preliminaries. In Section 3 we study the properties of solvable elements. We show that the Dixmier's open question is equivalent to the statement that each element in Δ_2 is unsolvable. In Section 4 we prove two reduction theorems which give sufficient conditions for an element being unsolvable. Finally, in Section 5 we give a geometric description of solvable elements.

2 Preliminaries

According to [5], A has a basis $p^iq^j,\ i,j \geq 0$. For each $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, define a subspace A_s of A by

$$A_s = \langle p^iq^j | j - i = s \rangle.$$

It is easy to check that $A_iA_j \subseteq A_{i+j}$ for all i, j. Therefore A becomes a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded algebra $A = \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} A_i$.

Denote the element $pq \in A$ by h. Then we have

$$[h, p] = -p, \quad [h, q] = q.$$

A short computation shows that (See [7, Lemma 2.1] or [8, Lemma 5.1])

$$f(h)p^n = p^n f(h - n) \quad \text{and} \quad f(h)q^n = q^n f(h + n)$$

for $f(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then each element of A_i for $i > 0$ (resp. $i < 0$; $i = 0$) can be uniquely expressed in the form $f(h)q^i$ (resp. $f(h)p^i$; $f(h)$), and hence each element in A can be written uniquely as

$$x = f_{-s}(h)p^s + \cdots + f_0(h) + \cdots + f_t(h)q^t, \quad f_i(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X],\ s, t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Define an automorphism ω of A by letting

$$\omega(p) = -q \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(q) = p.$$

Then we have $\omega(h) = -qp = 1 - h$, and hence $\omega(A_i) = A_{-i}$ for all i.

In the following we draw the standard terminologies and notation from [5].

For $x \in A$, let

$$\begin{aligned}
V(x) &= \{y \in A | \dim \langle (\text{ad } x)^m y | m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \rangle < \infty\},\\
N(x) &= \{y \in A | (\text{ad } x)^n y = 0 \quad \text{for some} \quad n > 0\},\\
C(x) &= \{y \in A | (\text{ad } x)y = 0\},\\
D(x) &= \{y \in A | (\text{ad } x)y = \lambda y \quad \text{for some} \quad \lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}\},\\
\mathbb{F}[x] &= \{f(x) \in A | f(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$ is an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}$. Then by [5, Corollary 6.7], the set $A - \mathbb{F}$ has the following partition:

$$A - \mathbb{F} = \cup_{i=1}^{5} \Delta_i,$$

where

$$\Delta_1 = \{x \in A - \mathbb{F} | N(x) = A,\ D(x) = C(x)\},$$
$$\Delta_2 = \{x \in A - \mathbb{F}, N(x) \neq A,\ N(x) \neq C(x),\ D(x) = C(x)\},$$
$$\Delta_3 = \{x \in A - \mathbb{F} | D(x) = A,\ N(x) = C(x)\},$$
$$\Delta_4 = \{x \in A - \mathbb{F} | D(x) \neq A,\ D(x) \neq C(x),\ N(x) = C(x)\},$$
$$\Delta_5 = \{x \in A - \mathbb{F} | D(x) = N(x) = C(x)\}.$$

It is clear that each Δ_i is invariant under every $\Phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$. An element x is called nilpotent (resp. strictly nilpotent) if $x \in \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ (resp. Δ_1). By definition it is easy to see that x is nilpotent if and only if $N(x) \neq C(x)$.

Let $f = \sum \alpha_{ij} X^i Y^j \in \mathbb{F}[X, Y]$, and let $E(f)$ denote the set of pairs (i, j) such that $\alpha_{ij} \neq 0$. For two real numbers ρ, σ we denote

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(f) = \sup_{(i,j)\in E(f)}(i\rho + j\sigma),$$

where we assign $-\infty$ to be $v_{\rho,\sigma}(0)$. We denote by $E_{\rho,\sigma}(f)$ the set of pairs (i, j) in $E(f)$ such that $i\rho + j\sigma = v_{\rho,\sigma}(f)$. Then $E_{\rho,\sigma}(f)$ is nonempty if $f \neq 0$. We say that f is (ρ, σ)-homogeneous of (ρ, σ)-degree $v_{\rho,\sigma}(f)$ if $E(f) = E_{\rho,\sigma}(f)$.

Let $x = \sum \alpha_{ij} p^i q^j \in A$. Then we define $E(x),\ v_{\rho,\sigma}(x),\ E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)$ to be those for the polynomial $f = \sum \alpha_{ij} X^i Y^j$. In particular, the polynomial

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} \alpha_{ij} X^i Y^j$$

is called the (ρ, σ)-*polynomial* of x, and the element

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} \alpha_{ij} p^i q^j$$

is called the (ρ, σ)-*term* of x.

Lemma 2.1. *([5, Lemma 2.4]) Let $x, y \in A$, and let ρ, σ be real numbers such that $\rho + \sigma > 0$. Then*

(1) the (ρ, σ)-polynomial of xy is the product of (ρ, σ)-polynomials of x and y.

(2) $v_{\rho,\sigma}(xy) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)$.

Let $x \in A$, and let ρ, σ, k be three positive numbers. Then it is clear that

$$E_{k\rho,k\sigma}(x) = E_{\rho,\sigma}(x), \quad v_{k\rho,k\sigma}(x) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(x).$$

It follows that $\rho_1/\sigma_1 \neq \rho_2/\sigma_2$, if $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x) \neq E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$, where $\rho_1, \sigma_1, \rho_2, \sigma_2$ are all positive numbers.

We assume in the sequel that $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of all pairs of relatively prime positive integers. We call $E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)$ an *edge* of x if it contains more than one point, and a *vertex* of x if it is a singleton. Thus, $E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)$ is an edge if and

only if the (ρ,σ)-polynomial of x is not a monomial. If the intersection of two edges of x is a vertex, we say that the vertex joins these two edges, and the two edges are adjacent. These terminologies can be geometrically described (see [6, Introduction]).

Example: Let $x = p^4 + p^3q + p^2q^2 + q^3 + q$. Then x has two edges

$$E_{1,1}(x) = \{(4,0),(3,1),(2,2)\}, \quad E_{1,2}(x) = \{(2,2),(0,3)\},$$

and they are joined by a vertex $E_{2,3}(x) = \{(2,2)\}$.

Since $E(x)$ is finite set, x can only have finitely many edges and vertices. It is also possible that x has no edges. For example: $x = p^2q^2 + pq + 1$. Then $E_{\rho,\sigma}(x) = \{(2,2)\}$ for all $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$.

3 Properties of solvable elements

Assume that $x \in A$ is solvable, and let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x,y] = 1$. Then we have $(\text{ad } x)^2 y = 0$ and hence $y \in V(x)$. But $y \notin C(x)$. So we have

$$V(x) \neq C(x)$$

and hence $x \notin \Delta_5$. Since $y \in N(x)$, so that $N(x) \neq C(x)$, we have $x \notin \Delta_3 \cup \Delta_4$. Thus, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *If $x \in A$ is solvable, then x is nilpotent.*

Lemma 3.2. *[5, Lemma 2.7] Assume that ρ and σ are integers such that $\rho+\sigma > 0$. Let x and y be elements in A, and let f and g be respectively their (ρ,σ)-polynomials. Then there exist elements $\mathfrak{t}, u \in A$ such that*

(a) $[x,y] = \mathfrak{t} + u$;

(b) $E(\mathfrak{t}) = E(\mathfrak{t},\rho,\sigma)$ and $v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathfrak{t}) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) - (\rho+\sigma)$;

(c) $v_{\rho,\sigma}(u) < v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) - (\rho+\sigma)$.

In addition, the following conditions are equivalent:

(1) $\mathfrak{t} = 0$;

(2) $g^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} = cf^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)}$ for some nonzero scalar c.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$ with $i > 0$ and $j < 0$. If $[x,y] = 0$, then either $x = 0$ or $y = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that $x = f_i(h)q^i \neq 0$ and $y = f_{-j}(h)p^j \neq 0$, where $f_i(X)$ and $g_{-j}(X)$ are polynomials of degree respectively k and l. Choose $\rho = \sigma = 1$. Then we have

$$v_{1,1}(x) = 2k + i, \quad v_{1,1}(y) = 2l + j,$$

and the (ρ,σ)-polynomials of x and y are respectively cX^kY^{k+i} and $c'X^{l+j}Y^l$, where $c, c' \in \mathbb{C} \setminus 0$.

Since $[x, y] = 0$, we have by Lemma 3.2 that

$$(cX^kY^{k+i})^{v_{1,1}(y)} = (c'X^{l+j}Y^l)^{v_{1,1}(x)},$$

implying that $k/(k+i) = (l+j)/l$, a contradiction. Thus, we must have $x = 0$ or $y = 0$. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \in A$ be solvable, let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$, and let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ be a pair such that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \geq \rho + \sigma$. Write $[x, y] = \mathfrak{t} + u$ as in Lemma 3.2. Then $\mathfrak{t} = 0$.*

Proof. By assumption we have $y \in A - \mathbb{F}$, which gives $v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) > 0$.

Suppose on the contrary that $\mathfrak{t} \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\rho,\sigma}([x, y]) &= v_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathfrak{t}) \\ &= v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) + v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) - (\rho + \sigma) \\ &\geq v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

contrary to the fact that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(1) = 0$. So we must have $\mathfrak{t} = 0$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $x \in A_i$ with $i > 0$. If $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \geq \rho + \sigma$ for some $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$, then x is unsolvable.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that x is solvable. Let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$. Since $1 \in A_0$, we must have $y \in A_{-i}$.

Let f and g be respectively the (ρ, σ)-polynomials of x and y. Write $[x, y] = \mathfrak{t}+u$ as in Lemma 3.2. Then we have by Lemma 3.4 that $\mathfrak{t} = 0$. Using Lemma 3.2 once again we get

$$g^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} = f^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)},$$

which leads to a contradiction by a similar argument as that used in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Thus, x is unsolvable. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let $x \in \Delta_1$ be a solvable element, and let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$. Then $y \in \Delta_1$.*

Proof. Since $x \in \Delta_1$, by [5, Theorem 9.1] there exists $\Phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ such that $\Phi(x) \in \mathbb{F}[q]$. Since Φ stabilizes Δ_1, we may assume that $x \in \mathbb{F}[q]$.

Let

$$x = c_0 + c_d q^d + c_{d+1} q^{d+1} + \cdots + c_n q^n, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{F},\ c_d \neq 0$$

and

$$y = y_{-s} + \cdots + y_0 + \cdots + y_t,\ y_i \in A_i,\ s, t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $[c_i q^i, y_j] \in A_{i+j}$ for all i, j, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [x, y] &= [c_d q^d + \cdots + c_n q^n, y_{-s} + \cdots + y_0 + \cdots + y_t] \\ &= [c_d q^d, y_{-s}] + u, \end{aligned}$$

where $u \in \sum_{i>d-s} A_i$.

If $s \neq d$, since $1 \in A_0$, we have $[c_d q^d, y_{-s}] = 0$ and hence $y_{-s} = 0$ by Lemma 3.3. It follows that $y = y_{-d} + \cdots + y_0 + \cdots + y_t$.

If $d > 1$, then since $v_{1,1}(x) \geq d \geq 2$, we have by Lemma 3.5 that x is unsolvable, contrary to the assumption. Therefore, we must have $d = 1$, which implies that $[x_1, y_{-1}] = 1$, so that y_{-1} is solvable. Now Lemma 3.5 implies that $v_{1,1}(y_{-1}) = 1$. Thus, we have $y_{-1} = b_{-1}p$ for some $b_{-1} \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0$ and hence

$$y = b_{-1}p + f_0(h) + \cdots + f_t(h)q^t.$$

If $t > 1$, then $[x, y] = 1$ implies that $[q^n, f_t(h)q^t] = 0$, which gives

$$q^n f_t(h)q^t - f_t(h)q^{t+h} = [f_t(h-n) - f_t(h)]q^{t+n} = 0.$$

Since A has no zero divisors, we have $f_t(h-n) - f_t(h) = 0$, implying that $f_t(X)$ is a scalar (denoted by b_t). It follows that

$$[x, y_t] = [x, b_t q^t] = 0$$

and hence $[x, y - y_t] = 1$.

Apply the above discussion to $y - y_t$ in place of y. Continue this process. Then we obtain

$$y_i = b_i q^i, \ b_i \in \mathbb{F} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq i \leq t,$$

and hence $y = b_{-1}p + b_0 + \cdots + b_t q^t$.

By [5, Theorem 8.10], the group $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$ is generated by elements

$$\exp(\mathrm{ad}\ \lambda p^n), \quad \exp(\mathrm{ad}\ \lambda q^n), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{F}, \ n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0.$$

It follows that $\exp(\mathrm{ad}\ f(q)) \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ for any polynomial $f(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ with $\deg f(X) > 0$.

Since $p \in \Delta_1$, we have

$$y = \exp\{-\mathrm{ad}\ b_{-1}^{-1}(b_0 q + \cdots + b_t \frac{1}{t+1} q^{t+1})\}(b_{-1}p) \in \Delta_1.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let $x \in A - \mathbb{F}$, and let $u = c_0 + c_1 x + \cdots + c_n x^n \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ with $c_n \neq 0$. If u is solvable, then $n = 1$.*

Proof. Since u is solvable, we have $C(u) = \mathbb{F}[u]$ by [7, Theorem 2.11]. Therefore x is a polynomial of u, since $x \in C(u)$. It follows that if $n > 1$, there exists a nonzero polynomial $f(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ such that $f(x) = 0$, contrary to [5, Proposition 2.5]. So we must have $n = 1$.

□

Theorem 3.8. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(1) Each endomorphism of A is an automorphism.

(2) Each solvable element in A is strictly nilpotent.

(3) Each element in Δ_2 is unsolvable.

Proof. The equivalence of (2) and (3) is immediate from Corollary 3.1.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Let $x \in A$ be solvable, and let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$. Then there exists a unique endomorphism φ of A such that $\varphi(p) = x$ and $\varphi(q) = y$. Hence $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ by (1), which shows that x is strictly nilpotent since p is so.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let φ be an endomorphism of A. Then $\varphi(q)$ is solvable and hence $\varphi(q) \in \Delta_1$ by (2). By [5, Corollary 6.7 (1)], we have $N(\varphi(q)) = A$. Then [5, Lemma 8.9 (1)] says that there is $\Phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ such that $\Phi\varphi(q) \in \mathbb{F}[q]$. Hence we have by Lemma 3.7 that

$$\Phi\varphi(q) = c_1 q + c_0, \quad c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{F},\ c_1 \neq 0.$$

Since $[\Phi\varphi(p), \Phi\varphi(q)] = [p, q] = 1$, the proof of Lemma 3.6 shows that

$$\Phi\varphi(p) = b_{-1}p + b_0 + \cdots + b_t q^t,\ b_i \in \mathbb{F}$$

for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly we have $b_{-1} = c_1^{-1}$.

Let

$$\Phi' = \exp\{\mathrm{ad}\ b_{-1}^{-1}(b_0 q + \cdots + b_t \frac{1}{t+1} q^{t+1})\} \in \mathrm{Aut}(A).$$

Then we have $\Phi\varphi(p) = \Phi'(b_{-1}p)$ and hence $\Phi'^{-1}\Phi\varphi(p) = b_{-1}p$. Since

$$\Phi'^{-1} = \exp\{-\mathrm{ad}\ b_{-1}^{-1}(b_0 q + \cdots + b_t \frac{1}{t+1} q^{t+1})\},$$

we have

$$\Phi'^{-1}\Phi\varphi(q) = \Phi\varphi(q) = c_1 q + c_0.$$

It is easily seen that the endomorphism $\Phi'^{-1}\Phi\varphi$ (of A) is indeed an automorphism. Therefore, $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$. □

Let us see what Lemma 3.7 implies. Recall the partition: $A - \mathbb{F} = \cup_{i=1}^{5} \Delta_i$. Given a polynomial $f(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ with $\deg f(X) > 1$, set

$$f(\Delta_i) = \{f(x) | x \in \Delta_i\} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq 5.$$

By Dixmier's problem 6 (proved in [8, Theorem 1.4] and [3, p.4]), we have $f(\Delta_5) \subseteq \Delta_5$. Therefore, $f(x)$ is unsolvable for $x \in \Delta_5$.

Let $x \in A - \mathbb{F}$. Then we have $C(x) = C(f(x))$ by [5, Corollary 4.5], whereas [5, Proposition 10.3] says that $N(x) = N(f(x))$. Therefore x is nilpotent (resp. strictly

nilpotent) if and only if $f(x)$ is nilpotent (resp. strictly nilpotent); that is (see [3, p.3]),

$$f(x) \in \Delta_i \Leftrightarrow x \in \Delta_i, \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Thus, Lemma 3.7 tells us that $f(\Delta_2)$ is a subset of Δ_2 consisting of unsolvable elements. In view of Theorem 3.8, this reduces the solution to the Dixmier's open question to determining the solvability of elements in the set

$$\Delta_2 - \underset{f,\ \deg f(X)>1}{\cup} f(\Delta_2).$$

4 Reduction theorems

In this section we establish two reduction theorems which give sufficient conditions for an element in A being unsolvable.

First, we determine the solvability of $x \in A$ if $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) < \rho + \sigma$ for some $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$. In view of $\omega \in \mathrm{Aut}(A)$, it suffices to assume that $\rho \geq \sigma$.

By the Division Algorithm, there exists unique integers l and r such that $\rho = l\sigma + r$, and $0 \leq r < \sigma$. Then x is of the form

$$x = c_{-1}p + c_0 + c_1 q + \cdots + c_l q^l, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{F}.$$

If $c_{-1} \neq 0$, then we have

$$x = \exp\{-\mathrm{ad}\ c_1^{-1}(c_0 q + \cdots + c_l \frac{1}{l+1} q^{l+1})\}(c_{-1}p) \in \Delta_1,$$

and hence x is solvable since $c_{-1}p$ is so; if $c_{-1} = 0$, so that x is a polynomial of q, then the solvability of x is given by Lemma 3.7.

In the sequel we assume that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \geq \rho + \sigma$ for all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$.

4.1 The first reduction theorem

We give a sufficient condition for an element in A being unsolvable in this subsection. The first lemma says that the majority of non-negatively graded elements are unsolvable.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $x = x_k + x_{k+1} + \cdots + x_n \in A$, $x_i \in A_i$. If $k > 1$, then x is unsolvable.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that x is solvable. Let

$$y = y_{-s} + \cdots + y_0 + \cdots + y_t, \quad y_i \in A_i,\ s, t \in \mathbb{N}$$

be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$.

Choose $\rho = \sigma = 1$. Recall from Section 2 that each element in A_i is of the form $f_i(h)q^i$ if $i \geq 0$ or $f_i(h)p^i$ if $i < 0$, so that its (ρ, σ)-degree is at least $|i|$ by Lemma 2.1.

It is no loss to assume that $x_k \neq 0$. First, we claim that $y_{-s} = 0$ if $s > 0$.

Suppose that $y_{-s} \neq 0$ and $s > 0$. Write

$$[x, y] = [x_k, y_{-s}] + y', \quad y' \in \sum_{i>k-s} A_i.$$

If $s \neq k$, then the fact that $[x_k, y_{-s}] \in A_{k-s}$ and $1 \in A_0$ yields $[x_k, y_{-s}] = 0$, contrary to Lemma 3.3. If $s = k$, then since $[x_k, y_{-k}] \in A_0$ and $y' \in \sum_{i>0} A_i$, we have $[x_k, y_{-k}] = 1$, so that x_k is solvable. This contradicts Lemma 3.5 since

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(x_k) \geq k \geq \rho + \sigma = 2.$$

Then the claim holds. It follows that

$$y = y_0 + \cdots + y_t,$$

implying that $[x, y] \in \sum_{i>0} A_i$, contrary to the fact that $1 \in A_0$.

Therefore, x is unsolvable. □

By applying the automorphism ω of A, we obtain that an element of the form

$$x = x_{-n} + \cdots + x_{-k-1} + x_{-k}, \quad x_i \in A_i,\ k > 1$$

is also unsolvable.

Define the *height* of an element $x = \sum x_i,\ x_i \in A_i$ by $\mathrm{ht}(x) = \max\{i | x_i \neq 0\}$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $x = x_s + x_{s+1} + \cdots + x_t \in A$, $x_i \in A_i$, $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $x_t \neq 0$, $t > 1$, and $C(x_t) = \mathbb{F}[x_t]$ or, if $x_s \neq 0$, $s < -1$, and $C(x_{-s}) = \mathbb{F}[x_{-s}]$, then x is unsolvable.*

Proof. In view of the automorphism ω of A, it suffices to prove the theorem under the assumptions $x_t \neq 0$, $t > 1$, and $C(x_t) = \mathbb{F}[x_t]$.

Suppose on the contrary that x is solvable. Then there is

$$y = y_{s'} + y_{s'+1} + \cdots + y_{t'} \in A, \quad y_j \in A_j,\ s', t' \in \mathbb{Z}$$

such that $[x, y] = 1$. Now that y is solvable, we have $\mathrm{ht}(y) = t' \geq -1$ by the conclusion following Lemma 4.1.

Write

$$[x, y] = [x_t, y_{t'}] + u, \quad u \in \sum_{i<t+t'} A_i.$$

Since $t + t' \geq 1$ and $1 \in A_0$, we obtain $[x_t, y_{t'}] = 0$ and hence $y_{t'} \in C(x_t) = \mathbb{F}[x_t]$. Let $f(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ be the polynomial such that $y_{t'} = f(x_t)$. Since $x_t^k \in A_{tk}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$f(X) = cX^n \quad \text{for some} \quad c \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0 \ \text{ and } \ n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and hence $y_{t'} = cx_t^n$, implying that $\mathrm{ht}(y) = t' = nt \geq 0$.

If $t' = 0$, so that $n = 0$ since $t > 1$, then $y_0 = c \in \mathbb{F}$. It follows that

$$[x, y_{s'} + y_{s'+1} + \cdots + y_{-1}] = [x, y - y_0] = 1,$$

a contradiction.

If $t' > 0$, since

$$\begin{aligned}(y - f(x))_{t'} &= y_{t'} - f(x)_{t'} \\ &= y_{t'} - cx_t^n \\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

we have $\mathrm{ht}(y - f(x)) < t' = \mathrm{ht}(y)$. Since $[x, y - f(x)] = 1$, the above discussion applies to $y - f(x)$ in place of y as long as $\mathrm{ht}(y - f(x)) > 0$. Continue this process. Then we will obtain an element y' such that $[x, y'] = 1$ and $\mathrm{ht}(y') \leq 0$, a contradiction.

Thus, x must be unsolvable. □

4.2 The second reduction theorem

In this subsection we establish the second sufficient condition for x being unsolvable.

Lemma 4.3. *([5, Proposition 7.4]) Let ρ, σ be positive integers such that $\rho \nmid \sigma$ and $\sigma \nmid \rho$. Let $x \in A$ with $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) > \rho + \sigma$. If the (ρ, σ)-polynomial of x is not a monomial, then $x \in \Delta_5$.*

By the lemma, if an element $x \in A$ is solvable, so that $x \notin \Delta_5$, and if x has an edge $E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)$ with $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$, then the assumption $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) > \rho + \sigma$ yields either $\rho | \sigma$ or $\sigma | \rho$; that is, either $\rho = 1$ or $\sigma = 1$.

In view of the automorphism ω of A, we assume that $\rho = n \geq 1$ and $\sigma = 1$ in the remainder of this subsection.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{F}[X, Y]$ be two (ρ, σ)-homogeneous polynomials with (ρ, σ)-degrees respectively w and v. Assume that f is not equal to f_1^m $(m > 1)$ for any polynomial $f_1 \in \mathbb{F}[X, Y]$. If $f^v = g^w$, then $w | v$ and hence $g = f^{v/w}$.*

Proof. Since $\rho = n$ and $\sigma = 1$, the (ρ, σ)-degree of a (ρ, σ)-homogeneous polynomial is divisible by n. Assume that $w = w_1 n$ and $v = v_1 n$ for some integers v_1 and w_1. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}f &= cX^{w_1}(Y^n/X \ - \lambda_1)^{s_1} \cdots (Y^n/X \ - \lambda_k)^{s_k}, \\ g &= c'X^{v_1}(Y^n/X \ - \mu_1)^{r_1} \cdots (Y^n/X \ - \mu_l)^{r_l}\end{aligned}$$

with $s_1, \ldots, s_k, r_1, \ldots r_l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$ and $c, c' \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0$, where $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ (resp. $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_l$) are distinct numbers in $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$.

Since $f^v = g^w$, we have $k = l$ and, by an rearrangement of indices, $\lambda_i = \mu_i$ for all i. It follows that $s_i v = r_i w$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Since f is not equal to f_1^m $(m > 1)$ for any polynomial f_1, we get $(s_1, \ldots, s_k) = 1$. Then since w divides $s_i v$ for all i, w divides

$$(s_1 v, \ldots, s_k v) = (s_1, \ldots, s_k)v = v,$$

implying that $g = f^{v/w}$, as desired. □

Theorem 4.5. *Let $x \in A$ be an element such that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \geq \rho + \sigma = n + 1$, and let f be its (ρ, σ)-polynomial. If f is not equal to f_1^m $(m > 1)$ for any $f_1 \in \mathbb{F}[X, Y]$, then x is unsolvable.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that x is solvable. Let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$, and let g be its (ρ, σ)-polynomial.

Write $[x, y] = \mathfrak{t} + u$ as in Lemma 3.2. Then we have $\mathfrak{t} = 0$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence, Lemma 3.2 says that

$$g^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} = c f^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)} \quad \text{for some } c \neq 0,$$

so that $g = c_l f^l$ $(c_l \neq 0)$ by Lemma 4.4, where $l = v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)/v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$.

Note that

$$[x, y - c_l x^l] = [x, y] = 1.$$

But $v_{\rho,\sigma}(y - c_l x^l) < v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)$, since $v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) - v_{\rho,\sigma}(c_l x^l) = g - c_l f^l = 0$.

Apply the above discussion to $y - c_l x^l$ in place of y, if $y - c_l x^l$ is not a scalar. Continue the process. Since $\rho > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$, so that the (ρ, σ)-degree of every element in $A - \mathbb{F}$ is positive, ultimately we will obtain a polynomial $h(X) \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ such that $y - h(x)$ is a scalar. It follows that $[x, y - h(x)] = 0$, contrary to the fact that $[x, y] = [x, y - h(x)]$.

Therefore, x must be unsolvable. □

5 A geometric characterization of solvable elements

In this section we give a necessary condition for an element $x \in A$ being solvable and having more than one edges.

Lemma 5.1. *Let i, j, i_0, j_0, a, b be real numbers such that $a < b$. If $ia + j \leq i_0 a + j_0$ and $ib + j < i_0 b + j$, then $iX + j < i_0 X + j_0$ for all $X \in (a, b)$.*

Proof. Define a function

$$f(X) = (i - i_0)X + (j - j_0), \quad X \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then the graph of $Y = f(X)$ is a line, on which the segment with X-coordinates between a and b lies below the X-axis, since $f(a) \leq 0$ and $f(b) < 0$ by assumption. Thus, we have $f(X) < 0$ and hence $iX + j < i_0 X + j_0$ for all $X \in (a, b)$. . □

Let $x = \sum \alpha_{ij} p^i q^j \in A$, and let $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$, $(\rho_1,\sigma_1), (\rho_2,\sigma_2) \in \mathcal{P}$, be two distinct edges of x. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Then intersection $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x) \cap E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$ contains at most one pair of integers.*

Proof. Recall from Section 2 that $\rho_1/\sigma_1 \neq \rho_2/\sigma_2$. If there are two pair of integers $(i_0, j_0), (i, j)$ contained in $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x) \cap E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} i\rho_1 + j\sigma_1 &= i_0\rho_1 + j_0\sigma_1, \\ i\rho_2 + j\sigma_2 &= i_0\rho_2 + j_0\sigma_2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} (i - i_0)\rho_1 + (j - j_0)\sigma_1 &= 0, \\ (i - i_0)\rho_2 + (j - j_0)\sigma_2 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The assumption $\rho/\sigma_1 \neq \rho_2/\sigma_2$ implies that $i - i_0 = j - j_0 = 0$, and hence $(i, j) = (i_0, j_0)$. This completes the proof. □

Let $x = \sum \alpha_{ij} p^i q^j \in A$, and assume that

$$E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x), \quad (\rho_1,\sigma_1),\ (\rho_2,\sigma_2) \in \mathcal{P},$$

are two adjacent edges of x joined by a vertex (i_0, j_0). By definition, the (ρ_1, σ_1)-term of x is of the form

$$\cdots + \alpha_{i_0,j_0} p^{i_0} q^{j_0},$$

and the (ρ_2, σ_2)-term of x is of the form

$$\alpha_{i_0,j_0} p^{i_0} q^{j_0} + \cdots .$$

Lemma 5.3. *(see [6, Proposition 3.7(3)]) There exists $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that the (ρ, σ)-term of x is $\alpha_{i_0,j_0} p^{i_0} q^{j_0}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\rho_1/\sigma_1 < \rho_2/\sigma_2$. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ be pair such that $\rho/\sigma \in (\rho_1/\sigma_1, \rho_2/\sigma_2)$. We show that (ρ, σ) is a desired pair.

By definition we need to show that

$$i\rho + j\sigma < i_0\rho + j_0\sigma \quad \text{for all} \quad (i, j) \in E(x) \setminus (i_0, j_0).$$

Let $(i, j) \in E(x) \setminus (i_0, j_0)$. Then since (i_0, j_0) joins $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$, meaning that $i_0\rho_l + j_0\sigma_l = v_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(x)$ for $l = 1, 2$, we have by Lemma 5.2

$$\text{either} \quad i\rho_1 + j\sigma_1 < i_0\rho_1 + j_0\sigma_1 \quad \text{or} \quad i\rho_2 + j\sigma_2 < i_0\rho_1 + j_0\sigma_1.$$

Without loss of generality we assume that

$$i\rho_1 + j\sigma_1 \leq i_0\rho_1 + j_0\sigma_1, \qquad i\rho_2 + j\sigma_2 < i_0\rho_2 + j_0\sigma_2$$

or, equivalently,

$$i\rho_1/\sigma_1 + j \le i_0\rho_1/\sigma_1 + j_0, \qquad i\rho_2/\sigma_2 + j < i_0\rho_2/\sigma_2 + j_0.$$

Then Lemma 5.1 says that $i\rho/\sigma + j < i_0\rho/\sigma + j_0$ and hence $i\rho + j\sigma < i_0\rho + j_0\sigma$. Therefore, the (ρ, σ)-term of x is $\alpha_{ij}p^{i_0}q^{j_0}$.

□

Note: The above proof shows that for any pair $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\rho/\sigma \in (\rho_1/\sigma_1, \rho_2/\sigma_2),$$

the (ρ, σ)-term of x is the same.

Lemma 5.4. *Keep the assumptions before Lemma 5.3 on x. In addition, assume that $v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \ge \rho+\sigma$ for all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$. If x is solvable with $y \in A$ such that $[x, y] = 1$, then y also has adjacent edges $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$, $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y)$.*

Proof. By our assumptions, the (ρ_1, σ_1)-polynomial and the (ρ_2, σ_2)-polynomial of x are respectively

$$\cdots + \alpha_{i_0,j_0}X^{i_0}Y^{j_0}$$

and

$$\alpha_{i_0,j_0}X^{i_0}Y^{j_0} + \cdots .$$

Since x is solvable, by Theorem 4.5 we may write these two polynomials respectively as $f_1^{r_1}$ $(r_1 > 1)$ and $f_2^{r_2}$ $(r_2 > 1)$ for some $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{F}[X, Y]$. We may further assume that, for $l = 1, 2$, f_l is no longer equal to κ_l^k $(k > 1)$ for any $\kappa_l \in \mathbb{F}[X, Y]$. Since $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$ are edges of x, neither f_1 nor f_2 is a monomial.

For each pair (ρ_l, σ_l), $l = 1, 2$, write $[x, y] = \mathfrak{t}+u$ as in Lemma 3.2. Then we have $\mathfrak{t} = 0$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence, by Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 4.4 the (ρ_l, σ_l)-polynomial of y is of the form

$$c_l f_l^{R_l}, \quad R_l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0,\ c_l \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0.$$

Thus, y has the edges $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y)$, which we are to show are adjacent.

Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ be a pair of integers such that $\rho/\sigma \in (\rho_1/\sigma_1, \rho_2/\sigma_2)$. By the proof of Lemma 5.3, the (ρ, σ)-polynomial of x is $\alpha_{i_0,j_0}X^{i_0}Y^{j_0}$. Let $y = \sum \beta_{ij}p^iq^j$ and let τ be its (ρ, σ)-polynomial. Write $[x, y] = \mathfrak{t} + u$ as in Lemma 3.2. Then we have $\mathfrak{t} = 0$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence Lemma 3.2 says that

$$\tau^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} = c(\alpha_{i_0,j_0}X^{i_0}Y^{j_0})^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)} \quad \text{for some } c \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0.$$

Therefore τ is a monomial, which we denote by $\beta_{st}X^sY^t$. Then

$$(X^sY^t)^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(x)} = (X^{i_0}Y^{j_0})^{v_{\rho,\sigma}(y)},$$

implying that $s/t = i_0/j_0$, so that $(s,t) = (Ki_0, Kj_0)$ for some $K > 0$. Since τ is the (ρ,σ)-polynomial of y, we have

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(y) = s\rho + t\sigma = Ki_0\rho + Kj_0\sigma,$$

which implies that

$$K = \max\{k > 0 | (ki_0, kj_0) \in E(y)\},$$

so that (s,t) is independent of the choice of (ρ,σ) as above. In other words, the element $\beta_{st}p^sq^t$ is the (ρ,σ)-term of y for any $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\rho/\sigma \in (\rho_1/\sigma_1, \rho_2/\sigma_2)$.

We now show that the vertex (s,t) joins $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y)$.

Choose a sequence of pairs $(\rho_{(n)}, \sigma_{(n)}) \in \mathcal{P},\ n = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that

$$\rho_{(n)}/\sigma_{(n)} \in (\rho_1/\sigma_1, \rho_2/\sigma_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho_{(n)}/\sigma_{(n)} = \rho_1/\sigma_1.$$

For each n, since $\beta_{st}p^sq^t$ is the $(\rho_{(n)}, \sigma_{(n)})$-term of y, we have

$$i\rho_{(n)} + j\sigma_{(n)} < s\rho_{(n)} + t\sigma_{(n)} \quad \text{for all} \quad (i,j) \in E(y) \setminus (s,t)$$

and hence

$$i\rho_{(n)}/\sigma_{(n)} + j < s\rho_{(n)}/\sigma_{(n)} + t \quad \text{for all} \quad (i,j) \in E(y) \setminus (s,t).$$

Taking the limit as $n \to \infty$, we get

$$i\rho_1/\sigma_1 + j \le s\rho_1/\sigma_1 + t \quad \text{for all} \quad (i,j) \in E(y) \setminus (s,t),$$

so that

$$i\rho_1 + j\sigma_1 \le s\rho_1 + t\sigma_1 \quad \text{for all} \quad (i,j) \in E(y) \setminus (s,t),$$

implying that $(s,t) \in E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$.

Similarly we obtain $(s,t) \in E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y)$. Then Lemma 5.2 says that

$$E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y) \cap E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y) = \{(s,t)\},$$

so that the edges $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y)$ are adjacent. □

Let $x \in A$ be an element having edges

$$E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y), \ldots, E_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(y), \quad (\rho_1,\sigma_1), \ldots, (\rho_k,\sigma_k) \in \mathcal{P},\ k \ge 2.$$

Then $\rho_1/\sigma_1, \ldots, \rho_k/\sigma_k$ are k distinct rational numbers. It's no loss of generality to assume that

$$\rho_1/\sigma_1 < \rho_2/\sigma_2 < \cdots < \rho_k/\sigma_k.$$

For each l, $1 \le l < k$, take $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\rho/\sigma \in (\rho_l/\sigma_l,\ \rho_{l+1}/\sigma_{l+1})$. Then $E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)$ is no longer an edge, hence it must be a vertex which, by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.4, joins $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_{l+1},\sigma_{l+1}}(x)$. Therefore, the edges $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_{l+1},\sigma_{l+1}}(x)$ are adjacent.

We claim that $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_{l+j},\sigma_{l+j}}(x)$ are not adjacent if $j > 1$. Suppose on the contrary that they are adjacent. Then by the proof of Lemma 5.3, $E_{\rho,\sigma}(x)$ is a vertex for any $(\rho,\sigma) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\rho/\sigma \in (\rho_l/\sigma_l, \rho_{l+j}/\sigma_{l+j})$, contrary to the fact that $E_{\rho_{l+1},\sigma_{l+1}}(x)$ is an edge. Therefore, two distinct edges

$$E_{\rho_i,\sigma_i}(x),\ E_{\rho_j,\sigma_j}(x), \quad 1 \le i < j \le k,$$

are adjacent if and only if $i = j - 1$.

We are now ready to study solvable elements in A using these conclusions.

In the following, assume that $x \in A$ is a solvable element having edges

$$E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x), \dots, E_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(x), \quad (\rho_1,\sigma_1), \dots, (\rho_k,\sigma_k) \in \mathcal{P},\ k \ge 2,$$

where $\rho_1/\sigma_1 < \cdots < \rho_k/\sigma_k$. We also assume that

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(x) \ge \rho + \sigma \quad \text{for all} \quad (\rho,\sigma) \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Then by Theorem 4.5, for each l, $1 \le l \le k$, the (ρ_l,σ_l)-polynomial of x is of the form $f_l^{r_l}$ $(r_l > 1)$ for some $f_l \in \mathbb{F}[X,Y]$. We assume that each f_l is no longer equal to κ^n $(n > 1)$ for any polynomial $\kappa \in \mathbb{F}[X,Y]$.

Lemma 5.5. *With these assumptions on x, we have*

$$(r_l, r_{l+1}) > 1 \quad \textit{for all} \quad 1 \le l < k.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $(r_1, r_2) > 1$. The other inequalities can be proved similarly.

We assume that $(r_1, r_2) = 1$ and derive a contradiction.

Let $x = \sum \alpha_{ij} p^i q^j$, and let (i_0, j_0) be the vertex of x joining $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x)$. Then we have

$$f_1^{r_1} = \cdots + \alpha_{i_0,j_0} X^{i_0} Y^{j_0}$$

and

$$f_2^{r_2} = \alpha_{i_0,j_0} X^{i_0} Y^{j_0} + \cdots .$$

Let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x,y] = 1$. By Lemma 5.4, y also has adjacent edges $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(y)$, $l = 1,2$. In particular, the proof of Lemma 5.4 shows that, for $l = 1,2$, the (ρ_l,σ_l)-polynomial of y is also of the form $c_l f_l^{R_l}$ for some $R_l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$ and $c_l \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0$.

Let (s,t) be the vertex joining $E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$ and $E_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y)$. Then we have

$$c_1 f_1^{R_1} = \cdots + \beta_{st} X^s Y^t$$

and

$$c_2 f_2^{R_2} = \beta_{st} X^s Y^t + \cdots .$$

From the proof of Lemma 5.4 we also obtain $i_0/j_0 = s/t$.

For brevity, set

$$\theta =: s/i_0\ (= t/j_0), \quad v_1 =: v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(f_1), \quad v_2 =: v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(f_2).$$

Since both x and y are solvable, so that $x, y \in A - \mathbb{F}$, v_1 and v_2 are both nonzero.

From above we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x) &= i_0\rho_1 + j_0\sigma_1 = r_1v_1, & v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x) &= i_0\rho_2 + j_0\sigma_2 = r_2v_2, \\ v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y) &= s\rho_1 + t\sigma_1 = R_1v_1, & v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y) &= s\rho_2 + t\sigma_2 = R_2v_2, \end{aligned}$$

implying that

$$R_1v_1 = \theta r_1v_1, \quad R_2v_2 = \theta r_2v_2$$

and hence

$$R_1 = \theta r_1, \quad R_2 = \theta r_2.$$

Write the rational number θ as m/n such that $(m, n) \in \mathcal{P}$. Then we get

$$nR_1 = mr_1, \quad nR_2 = mr_2$$

and hence $n|r_1$, $n|r_2$, since $(n, m) = 1$. It follows that $n = 1$, which yields

$$R_1 = mr_1, \quad R_2 = mr_2.$$

Set $y' = y - c_1x^m$. Then since $c_1f_1^{R_1} - c_1(f_1^{r_1})^m = 0$, the (ρ_1, σ_1)-degree of the (ρ_1, σ_1)-polynomial of y' is strictly less than that of y; that is, $v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y') < v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y)$. Since $[x, y'] = 1$, the above discussion applies to y' in place of y unless y' is a scalar. Continue this process. Then we will obtain that y is a polynomial of x, so that $[x, y] = 0$, a contradiction.

Therefore, we must have $(r_1, r_2) > 1$, as desired. □

Theorem 5.6. *Keep the assumptions on x before Lemma 5.5. Then*

$$(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k) > 1.$$

Proof. The case $k = 2$ is immediate from Lemma 5.5. Thus we assume that $k > 2$.

We assume that $(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k) = 1$ and derive a contradiction.

Let $y \in A$ be an element such that $[x, y] = 1$. Then Lemma 5.4 says that y also has k edges

$$E_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y), \ldots, E_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(y)$$

such that, for each l, $1 \le l < k$, the edges $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(y)$ and $E_{\rho_{l+1},\sigma_{l+1}}(y)$ are joined by a vertex which we denote now by (s_l, t_l). In addition, from the proof of Lemma 5.5 we have that, for $1 \le l \le k$, the (ρ_l, σ_l)-polynomial of y equals $c_lf_l^{R_l}$ for some $R_l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$ and $c_l \in \mathbb{F} \setminus 0$.

Set $v_l =: v_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(f_l)$ for $1 \le l \le k$. In view of the proof of Lemma 5.5, we have $v_l \neq 0$ for all l.

Since for all l with $1 \leq l < k$, (i_l, j_l) joins the edges $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(x)$, $E_{\rho_{l+1},\sigma_{l+1}}(x)$, and (s_l, t_l) joins the edges $E_{\rho_l,\sigma_l}(y)$, $E_{\rho_{l+1},\sigma_{l+1}}(y)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(x) &= i_1\rho_1 + j_1\sigma_1 = r_1v_1,\\
v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x) &= i_1\rho_2 + j_1\sigma_2 = r_2v_2,\\
v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(x) &= i_2\rho_2 + j_2\sigma_2 = r_2v_2,\\
&\cdots,\\
v_{\rho_{k-1},\sigma_{k-1}}(x) &= i_{k-1}\rho_{k-1} + j_{k-1}\sigma_{k-1} = r_{k-1}v_{k-1},\\
v_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(x) &= i_{k-1}\rho_k + j_{k-1}\sigma_k = r_kv_k,
\end{aligned} \tag{1}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(y) &= s_1\rho_1 + t_1\sigma_1 = R_1v_1,\\
v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y) &= s_1\rho_2 + t_1\sigma_2 = R_2v_1,\\
v_{\rho_2,\sigma_2}(y) &= s_2\rho_2 + t_2\sigma_2 = R_2v_2,\\
&\cdots,\\
v_{\rho_{k-1},\sigma_{k-1}}(y) &= s_{k-1}\rho_{k-1} + t_{k-1}\sigma_{k-1} = R_{k-1}v_{k-1},\\
v_{\rho_k,\sigma_k}(y) &= s_{k-1}\rho_k + t_{k-1}\sigma_k = R_kv_k.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}
$$

From the proof of Lemma 5.5 we have $s_l/i_l = t_l/j_l$ for $1 \leq l < k$. Then by the identities $i_1\rho_2 + j_1\sigma_2 = i_2\rho_2 + j_2\sigma_2$ obtained from (1) and $s_1\rho_2 + t_1\sigma_2 = s_2\rho_2 + t_2\sigma_2$ obtained from (2), we have

$$s_1/i_1 = t_1/j_1 = s_2/i_2 = t_2/j_2.$$

Inductively we obtain

$$s_1/i_1 = t_1/j_1 = s_2/i_2 = t_2/j_2 = \cdots = s_{k-1}/i_{k-1} = t_{k-1}/j_{k-1}.$$

Denote this rational number by m/n such that $(m, n) \in \mathcal{P}$. By comparing the identities (1) with the identities (2) we obtain

$$R_l/r_l = m/n \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq l \leq k.$$

Then the assumption $(r_1, \ldots, r_k) = 1$ leads to a contradiction by a similar argument as that used in the proof of Lemma 5.5. Therefore, we must have $(r_1, \ldots, r_k) > 1$, as desired. □

REFERENCES

[1] Kossivi Adjamagbo, Arno van den Essen, A proof of the equivalence of the Dixmier, Jacobian and Poisson conjectures, Acta Math. Vietnam **32(2-3)** (2007), 205-214.

[2] H. Bass, E. Connell, D. Wright, The Jacobian conjecture: reduction of degree and formal expansion of the inverse, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **7(2)** (1982), 287-330.

[3] V. V. Bavula, Dixmier's problem 6 for the Weyl algebra (the generic type problem), arXiv:math/0402244v1. 2004.

[4] V. V. Bavula, A question of Rentschler and the Dixmier Problem, Ann. Math. **154** (2001), 683-702.

[5] J. Dixmier, Sur Les Algebres de Weyl, Bull. Soc. Math. France **96** (1968), 209-242.

[6] J. A. Guccione, J. J. Guccione, C. Valqui, The Dixmier Conjecture and the shape of possible counterexamples, J. Algebra **399** (2014), 581-633.

[7] J. A. Guccione, J. J. Guccione, C. Valqui, On the centralizers in the Weyl algebra, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140(4)** (2012), 1233-1241.

[8] A. Joseph, The Weyl algebra-semisimple and nilpotent elements, Amer. J. Math. **97** (1975), 597-615.

[9] Alexei Belov-Kanel and Maxim Kontsevich, The Jacobian conjecture is stably equivalent to the Dixmier conjecture, Moscow Math. Journal **7** (2007), 209-218.

[10] L. Makar-Limanov, On automorphisms of Weyl algebra, Bull. Soc. Math. France **112** (1984), 359-363.

[11] Y. Tsuchimoto, Endomorphisms of Weyl algebra and p-curvatures, Osaka J. Math. **42** (2005), 435-452.